

HOME READING.

Mr. Cleveland Protests.

In the end of the ticket,
As you hardly can see,
Is the budget, though I am the dog
That keeps a wagging of me;
Can it be?

May howl, but the tail it wags me.
It shows that I used to be
Sheriff, and Mayor of Buffalo, too;

Or him to be wagging a dog like that,
But the thing for to do;

Now you
Know it shouldn't be so, but it's true.
Was he a Governor, I was a boy;
And a Senator learned was he;
When he ran for Vice-President I couldn't vote
And that's why he goes and wags me;

You see,
He makes weight with his long pedigree.

would like to show men I am grateful;
I would please to exalt in my glee;
A pantomime joyous my tail I would wag,
But the tail it gets up and wags me;

You'll agree,
He wags me, though I ought to wag he.

I sit on my haunches and wonder,
And I really wish that I knew—
Whether I am the watch-dog they say I am,
Or a blooming long-tailed Kangaroo;

For I do
Look more like a big kangaroo
—R. J. Burdette in Philadelphia Press.

Creeping Up the Stairs.

In the softly-falling twilight
Of a weary, weary day.
With a quiet step I entered
Where the children were at play;

I was brooding o'er some trouble;
That had met me unawares,

When a little voice came ringing,
"Me is creepin' up a stairs."

Ah! it touched the tenderest heart-string
With a breath and force divine,
And such melodies awakened
As words can never deline;

And I hurried down the stairs,
All forgetful of my cares,
When I saw the little creature
Slowly creeping up the stairs.

Suppose she step her heavily chambered
On her little hands and knees,
Like a magpie in the trees,
Till at last she reached the topmost,

When o'er all her world's affairs
She, delighted, stood a victor;

After creeping up the stairs.

Fainting heart, behold an image
Of man's brief and strutting life,
Whose best prizes must be captured
With noble, earnest strife;

Upward, upward reaching ever,
Bending over to the weight of cares,

Hoping, fearing, still expecting,
We go creeping up the stairs.

Mr. Blaine's Veracity.

SOME CYANAMIDE FOR BLAINE'S FOXES.

In a letter addressed to the Boston *Transcript*, Mr. E. D. Mead says:

The Nation of July 3 contains an editorial article upon Mr. Blaine's "Veracity," following up the bitter personal attack upon Mr. Blaine in which the Nation has been engaged for the last three months. Will you permit me to review this article in your columns?

The purpose of the article is to sustain the belief that Mr. Blaine was so conscious of the Mulligan letters proved him a knave, and that their publication involved his ruin, that he prayed on his knees to Mulligan for them, implored him to think of his wife and six children, and threatened suicide if they were not delivered up to him. The ground of this belief is that Mulligan says so. Mr. Blaine denies it. But when there is an issue of veracity between two witnesses, says the Nation, and one of them has already been convicted of untruth, the other must be believed. Mr. Blaine has been convicted of untruth, therefore Mulligan's story and its sundry implications must be believed. The Nation then proceeds to exhibit two glaring misstatements of Mr. Blaine's. (1) Mr. Blaine said in a speech in the House, April 24, 1876, that the Little Rock road derived its value from the State of Arkansas. The Nation affirms per contra, that the road "did not derive its value wholly from the State of Arkansas, but derived its then existing value from Congress, and especially from Mr. Blaine." (2) Mr. Blaine said: "Instead of receiving bonds of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Road as a gratuity, I never had one except at the regular market price, and instead of making a large fortune out of that company, I have incurred a severe pecuniary loss from my investment in its securities." The Nation says: "The evidence that he did not pay his Little Rock and Fort Smith bonds at the same price that others paid for them, that in fact he never bought any, but received a large sum in bonds and cash as a gratuity or commission, was produced in a variety of ways that neither Mr. Blaine nor any of his apologists ever afterward attempted to deny it. In the first place Mulligan produced a memorandum book in Blaine's handwriting, showing that he (Blaine) was to receive from Fisher \$130,000 of land grant bonds, and \$32,500 of first mortgage bonds, besides \$15,150 in money. Mulligan testified that Blaine did receive all these bonds, except \$36,000, which are still due him, and Blaine in one of his letters spoke of \$20,000 more as due him from Caldwell."

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity" is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settlement of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation for truth and veracity, and the testimony was unanimous that it was perfectly good," is false; 3, that the Nation's statement that Blaine and nothing whatever unusual, and there was nothing in the conversation which followed which presupposed any such scene. The only "hand" which could possibly give the publication of the letters was the loss of the Cincinnati nomination, which might have to be made in the hubbub before the letters could be explained. But this surely was a weak motive for "suicide." The public knows all the contents of the letters, and surely there is nothing alarming in them. The letter from Fisher to Blaine, which was missing, and which has been occasion of much imminent, was endorsed by Mulligan, "Fisher to Blaine, urging settle-

ment of Northern Pacific account." That was simply this, I just happened to find confirmed by the reference in Mr. Blaine's letter to Fisher, April 22, 1872. The Nation can look it up if it still cares about it.

"As between Mulligan and Blaine," to quote the Nation again at this point, "the issue of veracity would seem to be no longer open to doubt." But how does the Nation's own "veracity" appear in the light of this article? And let it own dictum be remembered; and if it is shown that it is here convicted of untruths, let the presumption remain against it in everything else it has said, and may have to say, on this point. I submit, then, 1, that both the Nation's points against Mr. Blaine's veracity are false; 2, that the Nation's statement that "several

witnesses were examined as to Mulligan's reputation